21. (Original)   The method according to claim 19 further comprising:

    decoding parameters associated with the images; and

    examining some of the decoded parameters associated with the images.

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are presently pending and stand rejected.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Jiang in view of U.S. Patent 7,133,046 ("Savekar"). Assignee respectfully submits that the inventors for Savekar are the same inventive entity as in the current case, filed on the same date as the current case, and assigned to the same entity (the Broadcom Corporation). See U.S. Patent 7,133,046 Cover Sheet; see also attached assignment for the current case. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 5 and 10, and dependent claims 6 and 7, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jiang.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "a display manager for determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers, and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the frame buffer".

Examiner has indicated that Jiang teaches a system comprising "a display manager 'monitor' (150, fig 1) for

determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers (auto-flip mechanism)(col. 6, lines 45-51), and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the frame buffer (col. 6, lines 45-[5]1)". Office Action (OA) at 2.

Assignee respectfully submits "determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers" does not read on the "auto-flip" mechanism referred to in col. 6, lines 45-51. For example, in col. 8, there are described different Autoflip operations". However, there is not teaching of "determining when to overwrite an existing image". Accordingly, for this reason alone, respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 1 and dependent claims 2-12.

Moreover, even if the "auto-flip mechanism" determined "when to overwrite an existing image" (which it does not), Jiang does not teach that any of the "auto-flip mechanism" operations are performed by the monitor, which Examiner claims is read on by the "display manager" limitation, OA at 2. Accordingly, even if the 'auto-flip mechanism" determined "when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers" and even if the "display manager" read on the "monitor", Jiang does not teach "a <u>display manager</u> for determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers, and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the frame buffer".

Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 1 and to

8

dependent claims 2-12, and request that Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim 3 recites "wherein the first memory stores an instruction set for the decoder". Examiner has indicated that Jiang teaches "wherein the first memory (190) stores an instruction set for the decoder (col. 4, lines 8-11)." OA at 3.

Col. 4, Lines 8-11 teaches that "The video stream decoder 180 buffers the compressed video data stream in a dynamic random access memory (DRAM) 190 which is coupled to the video stream decoder 180." (Emphasis Added). Assignee respectfully submits that "instruction set" does not read on "compressed video data stream".

Claim 9 recites that "wherein the first memory is a SRAM". Examiner has indicated that "SRAM is interpreted as any kind of RAM". OA at 4.

The Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") determines the scope of claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction "in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed. Cir. 2004); See also MPEP 2111. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999); See also MPEP 2111. Assignee submits that interpreting the claimed SRAM "as any kind of RAM" is beyond the "broadest

9

reasonable construction 'in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art" and is inconsistent "with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach". Moreover, Examiner has not provided any evidence that "those skilled in the art" would interpret SRAM "as any kind of RAM".

Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 9, and request that Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim 13 recites, among other limitations "first memory connected to the processor, the first memory storing instructions, wherein execution of the instructions by the first processor causes: decoding images; and overwriting an existing image after the processor receives a signal indicating when to overwrite the existing image".

Examiner makes reference to col. 9, lines 22-26. OA at 4. Col. 9, Lines 22-26 state that "The host interface 510 provides an interface to the graphics controller 140 for receipt of the compressed video data therefrom, and is coupled to the memory interface 520 for receipt of the video data from the memory 190." (Emphasis Added).

It is respectfully submitted that "instructions, wherein execution of the instructions by the first processor causes: decoding images; and overwriting an existing image after the processor receives a signal indicating when to overwrite the existing image" does not read on the "compressed video data".

Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 13 and to

dependent claims 14-21, and request that Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. It is believed that there is no fee associated with any of the actions requested herein. To the extent that there is any fee associated with any actions requested herein, the Commissioner is requested to charge such fee to deposit account 13-0017.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

May 1, 2007   Mirut Dalal - Reg. No. 44,052
                                     ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100

11